

AT AN ADJOURNED MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, VIRGINIA HELD ON THE 25TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2010 AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE BOARD CHAMBERS, MONTGOMERY COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER, 755 ROANOKE STREET, CHRISTIANSBURG, VIRGINIA:

PRESENT:	Annette S. Perkins	-Chair
	James D. Politis	-Vice Chair
	Mary W. Biggs	-Supervisors
	William H. Brown	
	Gary D. Creed	
	Doug Marrs	
	John A. Muffo	
	F. Craig Meadows	-County Administrator
	L. Carol Edmonds	-Assistant County Administrator
	Martin M. McMahon	-County Attorney
	Steve Sandy	-Planning Director
	Dari Jenkins	-Zoning Administrator
	Vickie L. Swinney	-Secretary, Board of Supervisors

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order.

INTO CLOSED MEETING

On a motion by Mary W. Biggs, seconded by William H. Brown and carried unanimously,

BE IT RESOLVED, The Board of Supervisors hereby enters into Closed Meeting for the purpose of discussing the following:

- Section 2.2-3711 (1) Discussion, Consideration or Interviews of Prospective Candidates for Employment; Assignment, Appointment, Promotion, Performance, Demotion, Salaries, Disciplining or Resignation of Specific Officers, Appointees or Employees of Any Public Body

1. AFD Advisory Board

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
Gary D. Creed	None
William H. Brown	
James D. Politis	
Mary W. Biggs	
Doug Marrs	
John A. Muffo	
Annette S. Perkins	

OUT OF CLOSED MEETING

On a motion by Doug Marrs, seconded by James D. Politis and carried unanimously,

BE IT RESOLVED, The Board of Supervisors ends their Closed Meeting to return to Regular Session.

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
William H. Brown	None
James D. Politis	
Mary W. Biggs	
Doug Marrs	
John A. Muffo	
Gary D. Creed	
Annette S. Perkins	

CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING

On a motion by William H. Brown, seconded by Mary W. Biggs and carried unanimously,

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors of Montgomery County has convened a Closed Meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3711 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of Montgomery County, Virginia hereby certifies that to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only

such public business matters as were identified in the motion conveying the closed meeting were heard, discussed or considered by the Board.

VOTE

AYES

James D. Politis
Mary W. Biggs
Doug Marrs
John A. Muffo
Gary D. Creed
William H. Brown
Annette S. Perkins

NAYS

None

ABSENT DURING VOTE

None

ABSENT DURING MEETING

None

INVOCATION

A moment of silence was lead by the Chair.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

PRESENTATION

VACo 2010 Achievement Award

Dean Lynch, VACo representative, presented a 2010 Achievement Award to Karen Edmonds, Montgomery County Human Resources Director, from VACo, in recognition of Montgomery County for regional collaboration for its New River Valley Training Program. The County and the towns of Blacksburg and Christiansburg offer joint orientation training for new employees and joint training in other areas such as customer service and diversity in order to reduce costs and staff time involved by sharing resources. Montgomery County is one of 13 counties to receive awards in the statewide program.

ADD TO THE AGENDA - ADDENDUM

On a motion by Mary W. Biggs, seconded by William H. Brown and carried unanimously,

The Addendum dated October 25, 2010 was added to the agenda as follows:

DELEGATION:

Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act (PPEA)

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

AYE

Mary W. Biggs

Doug Marrs

John A. Muffo

Gary D. Creed

William H. Brown

James D. Politis

Annette S. Perkins

NAY

None

DELEGATION

Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act (PPEA)

Christopher Lloyd, McGuire Woods Consulting, made a presentation on Public Private Partnerships for School Development. A PPEA is an alternative to the traditional design-bid-build process and will help speed up the design and construction phase of a project. A traditional method of design-bid-build averages three years to build but using a PPEA process would shorten this process by six to 18 months.

Mr. Lloyd provided a brief history of PPEA. The PPEA law was passed by the General Assembly in 2002. It allows for both solicited and unsolicited proposals for development and/or operation of a “qualifying project”. The public entity must adopt guidelines to consider project proposals. There is a two phase process, the conceptual and detailed. There are nearly 100 projects completed or underway statewide under the PPEA.

Mr. Lloyd stated that the PPEA are not the following:

- Not a panacea
- Not free money
- Not a finance tool
- No secret negotiations
- Not necessarily cheaper
- Not privatization

Mr. Lloyd provided information about the process of the PPEA and the pros and cons of using this process. He also provided examples of projects that were completed under PPEA, such as construction of two schools in Stafford County and two projects in Roanoke County.

Supervisor Muffo asked if the County would have the ability to include in the proposal for creative financing if a PPEA was solicited. Mr. Lloyd responded that yes they could request all bids include potential financing options. He cited an instance where the company provided a bridge loan until the locality's debt capacity was low enough to where the County could pay back the loan.

Supervisor Creed commented that using the PPEA process is not necessarily cheaper than the traditional design-bid-build process. He asked how fast a project can be completed under a PPEA. Mr. Lloyd responded that it really depends on where you are in the process. If you are at the beginning, then the PPEA would be faster as it will cut six to 18 months off the project process.

Mr. Meadows commented that the School Board is in the process of drafting guidelines.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Board of Equalization – Deadlines for Appeals

An Ordinance providing application and disposition deadlines for appeals filed by property owners and lessees with the Board of Equalization for the purpose of hearing complaints of inequality in the equalization of real estate assessments and/or that real estate is assessed at more than fair market value.

The County Attorney explained that an ordinance must be adopted to set deadlines to receive appeal applications to appear before the Board of Equalization (BOE) and a deadline for citizens to appear before the Board of Equalization. The deadline to request an appeal before the BOE is February 7, 2011. The BOE will hear appeals from January 18, 2011- March 4, 2011.

There being no speakers, the public hearing was closed.

Special Use Permit – Joseph & Elizabeth Maxwell (Agent: Rich Rosenfeld) Telecommunications Tower

A request by Joseph & Elizabeth Maxwell (Agent: Rich Rosenfeld) for a special use permit on 25.12 acres in a General Business (GB) zoning district to allow a 199 ft. telecommunications tower. The property is located at 1485 Harding Road, approximately 350 feet south of the intersection with Fleets Way (private), and is identified as Tax Parcel No. 041-A-60 (Acct # 012046) in the Mount Tabor Magisterial District (District A). The property currently lies in an area designated as Residential Transition in the 2025 Comprehensive Plan.

Steve Sandy, Planning Director, made a presentation on the request for a Telecommunications Tower on Harding Road. Mr. Sandy stated that the request is made on behalf of AT&T to improve cellular coverage along Harding Road (SR 785), increase in-building coverage, and to provide for additional carrying capacity for new technologies, such as the i-phone, which utilize high speed internet.

The property is a split zoned parcel with a portion zoned Residential (R-2) and a portion zoned General Business (GB). The proposed tower will be located in the general business portion of the property. The existing general business is a result of a 1982 rezoning to allow an automobile service and repair operation, The Bug Shop. A 100 ft buffer was added on all sides to comply with requirements set forth in the zoning ordinance, since the property was bordered on all sides by residential zoning district. The proposed location for the tower is 45 ft. from Harding Road and approximately 300 ft. from the closest residential structure.

On August 11, 2010 the Planning Commission held their public hearing on this request and tabled it to allow the applicant time to provide additional information. The Planning Commission questioned whether the applicant had properly demonstrated the need for a height of 199 feet or fully demonstrated recent attempts at seeking collocation opportunities.

Since the August 11th meeting, planning staff has been working with the applicant to address these concerns. AT&T proposed to reduce the height of the tower to 167 ft. with a 4 ft. lightening rod and submitted revised plans. The tower is to be a monopole structure with flush-mount antennas and painted in a neutral matte brown which will help it blend with the color of the surrounding trees. A vegetative buffer will be planted with evergreen trees and a nine foot high chain link privacy fence. AT&T also proposes to fence 50 ft x 60 ft. (3,000 sq. ft) of the proposed lease area. On the revised plans the proposed tower is approximately 45 ft. from Harding Road and approximately 300 ft. from the closest residential structure.

Mr. Sandy stated it may be advantageous for AT&T to shift the proposed tower site to the farthest northeast corner of the property so that the tower would be farther from Harding Road and residential structures while remaining in the General Business district.

Mr. Sandy reported there has been a large cry of opposition to this tower from the residents. Copies of e-mails were included in the Board of Supervisors packet all opposing the telecommunications tower including a petition submitted by Hara Misra containing 149 signatures.

At their October 21, 2010 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the special use permit with conditions. The Planning Commission did recommend the tower at the original requested height of 199 feet.

Supervisor Muffo questioned why the Planning Commission changed the height back from 167 ft to 199 ft. Steve Sandy responded that the Planning Commission felt it was a better solution to build one tower at a taller height with opportunity for co-locaters than to build multiple towers.

Supervisor Biggs asked if the Planning Commission addressed the letter from the Town of Blacksburg regarding their concerns with the proposed tower. Steve Sandy responded that their concerns were addressed.

Michael Pace, agent with Gentry Locke Rakes & Moore, addressed the Board regarding AT&T's request. Mr. Pace explained that the additional tower is needed to address existing coverage. He referred to the following letter dated October 19, 2010 that addresses AT&T's search for alternate sites.

October 19, 2010

By Email

Steve Sandy, Planning Director
Montgomery County
755 Roanoke St. Ste. 2A
Christiansburg, VA 24073-3177

Re: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, d/b/a AT&T Wireless
Application for Special Use Permit RO 533E-Maxwell
1457 Harding Road, Blacksburg, Virginia 24060
Property Owner: Joseph and Elizabeth Maxwell Trust
Tax Map No.: 041-A-60
Parcel I.D. No.: 012046
Mount Tabor Magisterial District - District A

Dear Steve:

We represent New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, d/b/a AT&T Wireless, in connection with this Application for Special Use Permit. This letter addresses concerns that AT&T Wireless has not successfully addressed the perceived negative impacts to the area because its coverage objectives could be met through collocation on existing structures in the area, particularly within the Town of Blacksburg.

AT&T Wireless' site acquisition subcontractor, Richard Rosenfeld, contacted Town of Blacksburg officials to discuss the Clay Street water tank as a potential collocation opportunity. Three alternatives were discussed. The first was the proposed collocation of antennas on the water tank itself. However, radiofrequency coverage analysis conducted by AT&T Wireless' engineers determined that the water tank was not of sufficient height to meet AT&T Wireless' coverage objectives which includes "in-building" coverage in addition to road coverage. Representatives of the Town of Blacksburg also expressed hesitation about leasing space on the tank and at its base due to the existing equipment supporting Ntelos' and Blacksburg's telecommunications antennas equipment attached to the water tank and related ground equipment. Accordingly, this alternative was rejected.

The second alternative was to build a new tower inside the Clay Street water tank compound, with AT&T Wireless' equipment to be placed on an adjacent parcel to avoid the concern about overcrowding the tank and ground space at the base of the tank. Representatives of the Town of Blacksburg informed Mr. Rosenfeld that this proposal was unacceptable.

The third alternative was to build a new tower on private land in the vicinity of the Clay Street water tank. However, the property owner declined to lease the site to AT&T Wireless.

As a result, none of the three alternatives were available to AT&T Wireless.

In addition, AT&T Wireless evaluated the church steeple located at Alleghany and Clay Streets in Blacksburg. It, too, was determined to lack sufficient height to satisfy AT&T's coverage objectives (it was shorter than the water tank). AT&T Wireless also evaluated the 50' wood transmission poles located within 1.3 miles of the water tank. However, these poles were too short and too far away from the coverage area to provide continuous, uninterrupted in-building and road coverage.

As a result, AT&T Wireless' radiofrequency engineers were asked to redesign the search area. The Maxwell property was evaluated and determined that it would provide optimal in-building and road coverage in the area to be served.

AT&T Wireless began its site search with the Blacksburg Clay Street water tank, which is 2300' above sea level. Having ruled out it and other collocation opportunities mentioned above, AT&T Wireless moved the site to the Maxwell property, which is 2200' above sea level. Subsequently, the site was moved on the Maxwell property to a different location that is 2100' above sea level. Effectively, AT&T Wireless' proposed site is now 150' lower than the Blacksburg water tank, which prompted AT&T Wireless to request the 199' tower to make up the difference in the lost height to achieve its coverage objectives.

Subsequently, additional radiofrequency studies showed that a 167' tower will provide adequate coverage, and AT&T has revised its request to reduce the height to 167'. The reduction in height from 199' to 167' will have an effect on coverage and likely will reduce the number of collocation opportunities for other carriers. At 199', AT&T Wireless can provide optimal in-building and road coverage. At 167', there is an approximate 20% degradation in coverage, particularly in in-building coverage. AT&T Wireless considers the coverage to be provided by a 167' tower at this site to be adequate, although not optimal. As we have previously mentioned, AT&T Wireless' objective is to provide continuous, uninterrupted coverage to people in their homes and offices, as well as in their vehicles.

Based on this information, AT&T Wireless requests that County staff reevaluate AT&T Wireless' application and amend its recommendation to eliminate the concerns regarding availability of suitable structures within the Town of Blacksburg for collocation purposes.

Sincerely,

GENTRY LOCKE RAKES & MOORE, LLP



G. Michael Pace, Jr.

Luke Hopkins spoke in opposition to the proposed telecommunications tower. Mr. Hopkins stated he is opposed to the tower location, tower design and size. He believes the location is a poor location due to the fact that the proposed site is in a low area on the property and will require a higher tower. The location is also on the General Business part of the property and therefore will not require a rezoning as it would if located on the part zoned residential. Mr. Hopkins also stated that Harding Road is part of the Trans American Bike route, which is the

longest bike route in the United States. The bike route uses natural, scenic, historical roads and this proposed tower will not blend in to the natural surroundings. He proposed placing the tower higher up on the Maxwells' property. This will allow for a shorter tower and will move it farther away from the residential area. The tower could be disguised as a tree with fake tree limbs and be an umbra color with a landscape buffer.

Mr. Hopkins stated he values the natural setting through Ellet Valley and asked that the Board consider other possible sites on the Maxwell property that will lessen the impact to the residents.

Kent Nakamoto spoke in opposition to the proposed telecommunications tower. Mr. Nakamoto stated the proposed tower is inappropriate for an entirely residential area. The business zoning of the site was imposed as a buffer for residential development around The Bug Shop. The proposed site is situated next to 80 acres of land that could be available in the future for residential development and the proposed use would degrade the attractiveness of the area for that purpose. He also stated that the proposed location for the tower presents a potential hazard to public safety. There is the possibility that the tower could fall or given the ice storms in the area, chunks of ice could fall. Mr. Nakamoto questioned the justification for this type of tower. He stated that given the rapidly advancing technology other less intrusive options are available. For example, Virginia Tech is installing a distributed antenna system to improve coverage for the campus which will not involve the large-scale towers like the one proposed on Harding Road.

Martha Wunsch spoke in opposition to the proposed telecommunications tower. Ms. Wunsch stated that a 200 foot tower will be located along a scenic Virginia Byway on a prominent ridge. It will be visible from Cedar Orchards and Clay Street development as well as Harding Road. This structure will be an eyesore in the view shed and believes it will impact the potential economic growth in the New River Valley. Ms. Wunsch cited concerns with safety issues if the tower should fall. The structure will fall across a utility line which supplies electricity to major portions of Montgomery and other counties. She believes that the proposed cell tower will serve the interest of AT&T, not the citizens on Montgomery County.

Matt Kidwell spoke in opposition to the proposed telecommunications tower. Mr. Kidwell stated there were over 20 people in attendance tonight that opposed the tower. He believes selecting a residential area or a space directly adjacent to residences is neither an appropriate, nor a wise decision. Mr. Kidwell asked if AT&T can choose another location on the Maxwells' property to move the tower farther away from residences.

Atwell Hopkins spoke in opposition to the proposed telecommunications tower. Mr. Hopkins moved to the Orchards because of the view. The tower will destroy the view shed and asked that another location be considered.

Lynne Wright spoke in opposition to the proposed telecommunications tower. Ms. Wright stated with the exception of the small lot rezoned general business as a buffer the surrounding lots are residential. She believes AT&T is taking advantage of this site because of the buffer zone. Ms. Wright also asked what types of procedures are in place for the affects of potential radiation from the cell tower on small children and the elderly.

G.T. Hopkins spoke in opposition to the proposed telecommunications tower. Mr. Hopkins stated a few years ago there were just a few telecommunications towers in the county and asked when will there be a hundred towers in the area. He believes that the need for telecommunications towers will be obsolete as the need for wireless service will be increasing. Mr. Hopkins also expressed concern about the possible hazards of the radiation emitted by the towers. There may be hazards that are as yet unconfirmed and he request the Board to consider building towers as least 2,000 feet from homes, families and public spaces.

Dr. Richard Jackson spoke in opposition to the proposed telecommunications tower. Dr. Jackson believes the County needs to preserve the natural beauty and environment. He stated he cannot believe that a multi-million dollar company cannot find another location.

Joesph Dickerson spoke in opposition to the proposed telecommunications tower. Mr. Dickerson stated he represents the younger generation and believes the proposed tower is an eyesore to the area.

Michael Hedgepeth commented that after reviewing the request he made several observations. He suggested that the tower be moved away from the road, paint the tower a light blue instead of an umber/brown color; and use something other than a galvanized metal pole.

Anna Pagano spoke in opposition to the proposed telecommunications tower. Ms. Pangano stated her family moved to Montgomery County because they loved the natural beauty and small town feel of the area. Their property borders the property for the proposed telecommunications tower. If approved, their home will be the closest residence to the cell tower with their daughter playing in the yard less than 100 yards away. She believes a cell tower will lower the value of their home and lower the salability of the property.

Ms. Pagano stated the proposed location for the cell tower is a small piece of commercially zoned property that was zoned in order to accommodate the existing business, The Bug Shop. She also pointed out that Harding Road is part of the Trans American Bike Route and the tower will mar the scenic, natural beauty of the area and will absolutely turn away tourists and tourism dollars. Ms. Pagano urged the Board to vote no to the proposed telecommunications tower.

Mike Pace responded to the public comments. He stated 92% of Americans have cell phones and depend upon wireless communications. Telecommunications towers provide public safety, public convenience, and is an economic development driver. The proposed tower will provide the opportunity for additional co-locators which is a benefit for the County. Mr. Pace stated if the special use permit is denied then a new request will be submitted for a site near the same location. He asked the Board of Supervisors to strike a balance and consider this request.

Supervisor Creed asked if AT&T would consider moving the tower farther away from residential structures and if this is an option.

Mr. Pace replied that the proposed tower location could be moved to another site on the Maxwells' property. AT&T did look at the property zoned residential which would require a rezoning and a special use permit. The Planning staff recommended that the general business zoned area be considered because only a special use permit will be needed. Mr. Pace stated he would have to check with the property owners to see if they are willing to lease the other area.

There being no further speakers, the public hearing was closed.

Rezoning Request – Bryan and Katie Katz

Request by Bryan & Katie Katz to rezone approximately 1.653 acres from Agricultural (A-1) to Community Business (CB), with possible proffered conditions, to allow an office for bus operations with an apartment. The property is located at 3653 Peppers Ferry Road; identified as Tax Parcel No. 064-A-92, (Account No. 002869) in the Riner Magisterial District (District D). The property currently lies in an area designated as Village Expansion in the 2025 Comprehensive Plan and further described as Mixed Use within the Belview Village Plan.

Steve Sandy, Planning Director, provided a summary of the request. The applicant has requested the rezoning of 1.653 acres from Agricultural to Community Business to allow an office for bus operations with an apartment. The applicant is proposing to submit a request for a special use permit in the near future to be allowed to park and/or store commercial buses on the property.

The proposed use of the structure would be an administrative office for University Travel to conduct business. The primary function of the office would be to serve as an office area to handle the logistics of bus travel. The office will be open to the public; however, it is estimated only a few clients will visit this location.

Mr. Sandy reported that this property is the former site of John's Auto Lot and the property has been used as business for many years. The applicant purchased the property with the intent of using it for a commercial business and the property was listed for sale as commercial property and was listed in the Commissioner of the Revenue's office as zoned commercial. The real estate assessment has recently been changed to correct this error.

In June 2010, the County received several telephone complaints regarding the storage and parking of large commercial buses and general commercial use of the property. A site visit was conducted and it was determined that the commercial use was not permitted in the Agricultural (A-1) district and that the use of the property for storage/parking of buses fits the definition of truck terminal. A truck terminal is not a permitted use in the Agricultural district. The applicant was sent a notice of violation order and was instructed to cease the business operation. All business use of the property and storage of buses have ceased.

The applicant has submitted a voluntarily proffer to exclude several by-right uses in the Community Business district, such as business/trade school, cemetery, community center, homeless shelter, library, school, telecommunications tower, just to name a few.

At their October 13, 2010 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezoning with several conditions. One of the conditions is that no commercial buses shall be parked or stored on the property until such time that the Montgomery County Zoning Ordinance is amended to either specifically allow the parking of large commercial buses as a permitted accessory use by right in the Community Business (CB) zoning district or when the property owner is allowed by special use permit from the Board of Supervisors.

Supervisor Marrs commented that when the Beview Village Plan was developed the residents in this area were very careful in planning what they wanted to see in the future for this area. He is not sure this is what the people want. He expressed concern with what can be parked on this site besides in addition to buses. He would hate to see a tractor trailer terminal located there.

Steve Sandy responded that this issue will be addressed during the special use permit request. This rezoning only allows for the operation of an office, with an apartment.

Bryan Katz, applicant, addressed the Board about his request. Mr. Katz reported he has spoken with the residents and adjoining property owners in regard to his business plan. He has received a tremendous amount of support from them. He stated he has no intentions of changing the look of the property other than upgrading the landscaping. The property will be used by University Travel for their office space. It is his intention to submit an application for a special use permit to allow the parking of the buses on the property. They do not intend to have more than 2-5 buses on the property.

The Chair opened the public hearing for comments.

There being no speakers, the public hearing was closed.

Ordinance Amending Chapter 10, Entitled Zoning, Section 10-37- Flood Damage Prevention Overlay – **CONTINUE TO NOVEMBER 22, 2010**

An ordinance amending Chapter 10, Entitled Zoning, Section 10-37 of the Code of the County of Montgomery, Virginia by amending the Flood Damage Prevention Overlay to modify the language of the ordinance as it relates to modification, alteration, repair, reconstruction or improvement of any kind to existing structures located in any floodplain areas to an extent or amount less than fifty (50) percent of its market value.

At their October 20, 2010 meeting, the Planning Commission tabled this public hearing; therefore the Board of Supervisors will continue this public hearing until the November 22, 2010 meeting.

RECESS

The Board took a ten minute recess at 10:30 p.m. and reconvened at 10:40 p.m.

PUBLIC ADDRESS

Jeff Mitchell expressed his appreciation to the Board for allowing time for a presentation on the Public-Private Educational Facilities Infrastructure Act (PPEA). He believes the PPEA represents exciting possibilities in resolving school capital needs. He asked the Board to take the necessary steps in moving forward and asked them to urge the School Board to move forward in approving the necessary guidelines. Mr. Mitchell asked the Board to cease their focus on funding repairs to the Blacksburg High School and send clear directions to the School Board to quit their focus on repairs also. He asked the Board of Supervisors to take actions necessary to authorize the next level of funding for the Auburn School design. He knows the Board of Supervisors supports the school projects in Auburn and believes it's time to get them in the mix and move this project forward. Mr. Mitchell asked the Board to investigate USDA Rural Development funding and present their findings to the public. He asked that the Board of Supervisors and the School Board work together in moving forward.

Suzanna Ducker expressed her appreciation to the Board for considering more discussions on the school capital issues. Ms. Ducker expressed her concerns with the rising cost of repairs to the Blacksburg High School, which do not include cost for repairs that have to be made to meet the code requirements. Ms. Ducker asked if the Board was willing to repair a high school for \$20 million or more when a new school can be constructed for \$40 million, without the inclusion of a community room. She expressed concerns about the loss of businesses in the area because there is no high school. Ms. Ducker urged the Board to consider the construction of a new Blacksburg High School.

Jay Wilkins spoke in favor of the construction of two new high schools (Blacksburg and Auburn) and the renovation of the old Auburn High School for a middle school. Mr. Wilkins asked that the Board find a way to finance these projects and not waste any more money or time on repairing the BHS.

Laura Wilkins commented that there are numerous school capital needs in the County. Schools across the County are overcrowded and need addressing. Ms. Wilkins urged the Board to take action and move forward to pursue funding, such as the USDA Rural Development funds or PPEA. She also supports raising taxes to an appropriate level to meet the school capital needs.

Ivi Brenner stated we are stewardships to children and that the voices of the children are not being heard. Ms. Brenner stated that there is a need for a new high school in Blacksburg because the children need a safe environment.

Kevin Brenner expressed his appreciation for the hard work the Board of Supervisors is doing to help solve the Blacksburg High School issue. Mr. Brenner stated that a new school is vital for the economic growth in the county and to retain and recruit employees. He stated that during interviews with prospective employees the question of the quality of schools always arises. He urged the Board to build a new school in Blacksburg and Auburn.

Jennifer Finrich stated the Board of Supervisors has the power to make key changes. She stated the County needs safe facilities for all its students. Mr. Finrich asked the Board to continue their discussion with state representatives and to consider any PPEA proposals. She believes there are numerous misconceptions and confusion in the community over repair costs and new construction costs. Ms. Finrich stated she doesn't know one person who is willing to send their children back to the Blacksburg High School. She supports the construction of a new facility.

David Guy asked the Board if they support the School Board and education. Mr. Guy provided statistics on high school graduation and how it is important to the economy. He asked the Board to take a more noble path and support the teachers in the school system, which he believes are more important than buildings.

Brad Hill presented three options for a new Auburn High School as follows:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| Option 1: | Use Rural Development Funds |
| | Amount Financed \$40 million |
| | Interest Rate 4% |
| | Payoff Term 40 years |
| | Cost to Citizens less than three cents (.028 cents) |
| Option 2a: | Finance using Regular Method |
| | Amount Financed \$40 million |
| | Interest Rate 4% |
| | Payoff Term 20 years |
| | Cost to Citizens a little more than four cents (.041 cents) |
| Option 2b: | Finance using regular method after paying down loan with monies in house |
| | Amount Financed \$28 million |
| | Interest Rate 4% |
| | Payoff Term 20 years |
| | Cost to Citizens less than three cents (.029 cents) |

Mr. Hill believes now is the time to bid because construction costs and interest rates are both down. He stated that Auburn High School has been at a critical stage for over 16 years and needs to be replaced. He doesn't understand why the County is building a courthouse and renovating the old courthouse for a public safety building when there are so many school capital needs.

Julie Snyder spoke in support of a new Auburn High School and Middle School. She urged the Board to act on Auburn now. Ms. Snyder stated she has spoke before the Board of Supervisors in 2005 and requested something be done then. In 2006 the Board of Supervisors approved borrowing up to \$130 million in bonds for capital projects, which included Auburn. The Board of Supervisors rezoned land and allocated funding for studies for the Auburn projects. Auburn had the land and was ready to go but was put on hold due to the economic downturn and waiting for the County to find land for the Prices Fork Elementary School. Now Auburn is once again held up due to the Blacksburg High School issue. Ms. Snyder stated she supports a new

Blacksburg High School but urged the Board not to put Auburn on hold and asked them to move forward with a plan to build both schools.

Mary Ann Bonado thanked the Board for allowing a presentation to be given on the PPEA. She asked that the Board move forward with the appropriate steps to get this process going.

Jennifer Mengle stated there are a lot of issues to be decided and the Board needs to think about all the students. Ms. Mengle stated she has not supported tax increases in the past; however, she would like to see a presentation on USDA Rural Development funds and how this could be another option for financing. The County needs to find creative ways for financing. She stated that the Auburn schools are in critical need of replacement.

Ed Lawhorn representing The Blacksburg Partnership, presented the following resolution that was adopted by The Blacksburg Partnership on October 19, 2010 regarding the Blacksburg High School:

Resolution in Support of Blacksburg High School Community Input

Whereas, the Blacksburg Partnership is a business, government, and university partnership that seeks to boost economic growth and positive quality of life in the greater Blacksburg region; and

Whereas, the Partnership represents 40 businesses or affiliated organizations employing thousands of people; and

Whereas, many of the students of our businesses' and organizations' employees reside throughout the western and northern end of the county in addition to the Blacksburg corporate limits; and

Whereas, the Partnership board believes that quality schools in the county, and particularly the Montgomery County high school in Blacksburg, are vital recruitment features for our businesses to attract highly motivated and capable employees; and

Whereas, we are very concerned about negative perceptions now brewing with our employees and potential employees concerning the county's commitment to top quality facilities; and

Whereas, our county and its students averted widespread tragedy and heartbreak when the roof of the Blacksburg High School gymnasium collapsed earlier this year; and

Whereas, this calamity affords the county and school district leadership an opportunity to assess past problems with the school in the context of future needs with a long-range vision; and

Whereas, virtually everyone on this governing board lives in Montgomery County and fully understands the gravity of the county's decision and its impact on taxation; and

Whereas, the decision concerning the future disposition of the Blacksburg High School will affect future business growth potential in Montgomery County; and

Whereas, the repair or build decision not only affects perceptions about commitment, but also could affect taxation rates on our homes and businesses.

Now therefore, we respectfully request that the Montgomery County Board of Supervisors work diligently with the school board, school district administrators, and county administrators to address citizen concerns about safety, fully understand the fiscal implications of investing significantly in repairing a facility where some question its useful life, and seek to find creative funding solutions to either repairing or building a new high school; and

We also ask that the county leadership take maximum possible efforts to inform and involve parents, citizens, businesses, and affected organizations in the fact finding and communicate the implications of the options to all concerned.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of The Blacksburg Partnership, October 19, 2010.

Ed Lawhorn, Chairman



There being no further speakers, the public address session was closed.

EXTEND MEETING

On a motion by Mary W. Biggs, seconded by James D. Politis and carried unanimously, the Board hereby extends the October 25, 2010 meeting beyond 11:30 p.m.

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
John A. Muffo	None
Doug Marrs	
Mary W. Biggs	
James D. Politis	
William H. Brown	
Gary D. Creed	
Annette S. Perkins	

CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by William H. Brown, seconded by Mary W. Biggs and carried unanimously, the Consent Agenda dated October 25, 2010 was approved.

The vote on the foregoing resolution was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
Doug Marrs	None
John A. Muffo	
Gary D. Creed	
William H. Brown	
James D. Politis	
Mary W. Biggs	
Annette S. Perkins	

A-FY-11-36 SHERIFF RECOVERED COSTS

On a motion by William H. Brown, seconded by Mary W. Biggs and carried unanimously,

BE IT RESOLVED, By the Board of Supervisors of Montgomery County, Virginia that the General Fund was granted an appropriation in addition to the annual appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011, for the function and in the amount as follows:

320	Sheriff County	\$	926
-----	----------------	----	-----

322	Sheriff – Project Lifesaver	<u>\$ 150</u>
	Total	\$1,076

The sources of the funds for the foregoing appropriation are as follows:

<u>Revenue Account</u>		
419108	Recovered Costs	\$ 926
424401	Project Lifesaver	<u>\$ 150</u>
	Total	\$1,076

Said resolution appropriates recovered costs and project life saver funds for use by the Sheriff's department.

**A-FY-11-37
PLANNING & GIS
TECHNOLOGY FEE
FY 10 YEAR END CARRYOVER**

On a motion by William H. Brown, seconded by Mary W. Biggs and carried unanimously,

BE IT RESOLVED, By the Board of Supervisors of Montgomery County, Virginia that the General Fund was granted an appropriation in addition to the annual appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011 for the function and in the amount as follows:

800	Planning and GIS	\$1,386
-----	------------------	---------

The source of the funds for the foregoing appropriation is as follows:

<u>Revenue Account</u>		
02- 451205	Designated Fund Balance	\$1,386

Said resolution appropriates remaining designated technology fee funds that were not expended by year-end FY 10.

**A-FY-11-38
GENERAL SERVICES
LANDFILL RESERVE - MID-COUNTY LANDFILL**

On a motion by William H. Brown, seconded by Mary W. Biggs and carried unanimously,

BE IT RESOLVED, By the Board of Supervisors of Montgomery County, Virginia that the General Fund was granted an appropriation in addition to the annual appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011, for the function and in the amount as follows:

400	General Services	\$96,954
-----	------------------	----------

The source of funds for the foregoing appropriation is as follows:

451205 Designated Fund Balance – Landfill Reserve \$96,954

Said resolution appropriates funds from the Landfill Reserve for Mid-County Landfill remediation costs.

A-FY-11-39
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION
HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION
TRANSFER FROM SPECIAL CONTINGENCIES FOR
RETIREMENT INCENTIVES

On a motion by William H. Brown, seconded by Mary W. Biggs and carried unanimously,

BE IT RESOLVED, By the Board of Supervisors of Montgomery County, Virginia that a transfer of appropriation is hereby authorized, as follows:

FROM:

960 Special Contingencies (\$81,684)

TO:

110 County Administration -
 Human Resources \$81,684

Said resolution transfers funds from Special Contingencies to County Administration-Human Resources for the costs associated with retirement incentives.

OLD BUSINESS

ORD-FY-11-04
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 2, DIVISION 5, SECTION 2-107
OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, VIRGINIA
ENTITLED TAX EXEMPTION AND DEFERRALS FOR ELDERLY AND
HANDICAPPED BY INCREASING THE NET COMBINED FINANCIAL WORTH AND
THE INCOME LIMITS TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR RELIEF

On a motion by Doug Marrs, seconded by Mary W. Biggs and carried unanimously,

BE IT ORDAINED, By the Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery, Virginia, that Chapter 2, Division 5, Section 2-107 of the Code of the County of Montgomery, Virginia entitled Tax Exemption and Deferrals for Elderly and Handicapped shall be amended and reordained as follows:

Sec. 2-107. Established; restrictions and conditions.

(a) The board of supervisors of the county hereby provides for the exemption from or deferral of taxation of real estate, and manufactured homes as defined in Code of Virginia, § 36-85.3, or any portion thereof, owned by and occupied as the sole dwelling of a person not less than sixty-five (65) years of age, and providing the same exemption for such property of a person who is determined to be permanently and totally disabled as provided in subsection (e) of this section, subject to the following restrictions and conditions:

- (1) That the total combined income during the immediately preceding calendar year from all sources of the owners of the dwelling living therein and of the owners' relatives living in the dwelling does not exceed ~~forty thousand (\$40,000)~~ forty-five thousand dollars (\$45,000) provided that the first ten thousand dollars (\$10,000.00) of income of each relative other than the spouse of the owner who is living in the dwelling and the first ten thousand dollars (\$10,000.00) of income for an owner who is permanently disabled shall not be included in such total.
- (2) That the net combined financial worth, including the present value of all equitable interests, as of December thirty-first of the immediately preceding calendar year, of the owners, and of the spouse of any owner, excluding the value of the dwelling and furnishings in the dwelling including furniture, household appliances and other items typically used in a home and the land, not exceeding one (1) acre, upon which it is situated does not exceed one hundred twenty-five thousand dollars ~~(\$100,000)~~ (\$125,000).
- (3) That the person or persons claiming such exemption files annually no later than the first day of March of the taxable year with the commissioner of the revenue of the county, on forms to be supplied by the county, an affidavit or written statement setting forth the names of the related persons occupying such real estate; that the total combined net worth, including equitable interests, and the combined income from all sources of the person as specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection does not exceed the limits prescribed in this section. If such person is under sixty-five (65) years of age, such form shall have attached thereto a certification by the Social Security Administration, the Department of Veterans Affairs, or the Railroad Retirement Board, or if such person is not eligible for certification by any of these agencies, a sworn affidavit by two (2) medical doctors who are either licensed to practice medicine in the Commonwealth or who are military officers on active duty who practice medicine with the United States Armed Forces, to the effect that such person is permanently and totally disabled as defined in subsection (e); however, a certification pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 4-23(d) by the Social Security Administration so long as the person remains eligible for such Social Security benefits shall

be deemed to satisfy such definition in subsection (e). The affidavit of at least one (1) of the doctors shall be based upon a physical examination of the person by such doctor. The affidavit of one of the doctors may be based upon medical information contained in the records of the Civil Service Commission which is relevant to the standards for determining permanent and total disability as defined in subsection (e). Such certification, written statement, or affidavit shall be filed after the first day of January of each year, but before the first day of April of each year, for the permanently and totally disabled, for hardship cases, and for the first time applicants. The commissioner of the revenue has the discretion to accept late filings of first time applicants or for hardship cases until the thirty-first day of December of the taxable year. The commissioner of the revenue of the county shall make any other reasonably necessary inquiry of persons seeking such exemption, requiring answers under oath to determine qualifications as specified in this section, including qualifications as permanently and totally disabled as defined in subsection (e) and qualification for the exclusion of life insurance benefits paid upon the death of an owner of a dwelling. The commissioner of the revenue of the county is hereby empowered, in addition to require the production of certified tax returns to establish the income or financial worth of any applicant for tax relief or deferral.

(b) Such exemptions may be granted for any year following the date that the qualifying individual occupying such dwelling and owning title, or partial title, thereto reaches the age of sixty-five (65) years or for any year following the date the disability occurred. Changes in respect to income, financial worth, ownership of property or other factors occurring during the taxable year for which the affidavit is filed, and having the effect of exceeding or violating the limitations and conditions provided in this section shall nullify any exemption or deferral for the remainder of the current taxable year and the taxable year immediately following. The amount of exemption of the real estate tax for qualified persons shall be determined by the following table:

<i>Annual Income (Calendar Year)</i>	<i>For Qualified Persons the Percentage of Tax Which May Be Exempted</i>
\$0--\$25,600 <u>\$28,800</u>	100%
\$25,601--\$32,000 <u>\$28,801--\$36,000</u>	60%
\$32,001--\$40,000 <u>\$36,001--\$45,000</u>	40%

(c) The person or persons qualifying for and claiming deferral shall be relieved of real estate tax liability levied on the qualifying dwelling and land up to an amount equal to one hundred (100) percent of this liability, the amount to be deferred to be elected by the claimant. If a deferral of real estate taxes, the accumulated amount of taxes deferred shall be paid without penalty or interest to the county by the vendor upon the sale of the dwelling, or from the estate of the decedent within one (1) year after the

death of the last owner thereof who qualified for tax deferral by the provisions of this section. Such deferred real estate taxes shall constitute a lien upon such real estate as if they had been assessed without regard to the deferral permitted by this section. Any such lien shall, to the extent that it exceeds in the aggregate ten (10) percent of the price for which such real estate may be sold, be inferior to all other liens of record.

(d) The board of supervisors of the county hereby deems those persons falling within the limits and conditions provided in subsections (a) and (b) of this section to bearing an extraordinary tax burden on the real estate described in this section in relation to their income and financial worth.

(e) For the purposes of this division, a person is permanently and totally disabled if he or she is so certified as required in paragraph (a)(3) of this section and is found by the commissioner of the revenue of the county under paragraph (a)(3) to be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment or deformity which can be expected to result in death or can be expected to last for the duration of such person's life.

This change in income limits shall be effective for the ~~2010~~ 2011 tax year and beyond unless amended.

The vote on the foregoing ordinance was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
John A. Muffo	None
Gary D. Creed	
William H. Brown	
James D. Politis	
Mary W. Biggs	
Doug Marrs	
Annette S. Perkins	

NEW BUSINESS

R-FY-11-40 RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF A PETITION SEEKING CONCURRENT JURISDICTION WITH VIRGINIA TECH POLICE

On a motion by William H. Brown, seconded by James D. Politis and carried unanimously,

WHEREAS, Virginia Code Section 23-234 authorizes local governing bodies to petition the Circuit Court for concurrent jurisdiction with the police officers of an institute of higher education; and

WHEREAS, The Chief of Police for the Towns of Blacksburg and Christiansburg along with the Sheriff of Montgomery County, have requested the governing bodies of their respective jurisdictions to petition the Circuit Court granting the Virginia Tech Police officers concurrent jurisdiction within the two Towns and the unincorporated area of Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, The Virginia Tech Vice President for Administrative Services and the Virginia Tech Chief of Police concur with seeking concurrent jurisdiction.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery, Virginia, that the Board of Supervisors hereby agrees with the County of Montgomery requesting the Circuit Court to grant concurrent jurisdiction with the Virginia Tech Police Officers as authorized by Virginia Code §23-234 and as specifically authorized in the Petition and Order Establishing Concurrent Jurisdiction which is hereby attached and made a part of this Resolution; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the County Attorney is hereby authorized to file with the Circuit Court the Petition and Order Establishing Concurrent Jurisdiction on behalf of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery, Virginia.

The vote on the foregoing resolution was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
Gary D. Creed	None
William H. Brown	
James D. Politis	
Mary W. Biggs	
Doug Marrs	
John A. Muffo	
Annette S. Perkins	

R-FY-11-41
RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE FORMATION OF
NEW RIVER VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS REGIONAL
AUTHORITY AND THE APPROVAL OF THE MEMORANDUM OF
UNDERSTANDING REGARDING THE FORMATION OF THE AUTHORITY

On a motion by Doug Marrs, seconded by William H. Brown and carried unanimously,

WHEREAS, The County of Montgomery has participated in and has been a party to numerous regional 9-1-1 emergency communications consolidation feasibility studies in order to determine whether it is technically, practically and economically feasible to establish a regional 9-1-1 emergency center and a radio system serving all jurisdictions within the County of Montgomery and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; and

WHEREAS, Based on these studies, the Board of Supervisors has determined that participation in a regional 9-1-1 Authority with the Town of Blacksburg, the Town of Christiansburg and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University is the best means to provide a responsive and efficient means of handling 9-1-1 emergency communications within the County; and

WHEREAS, The Virginia General Assembly enacted the New River Valley Emergency Communications Regional Authority Act, effective July 1, 2010 (“the Act”), enabling the County of Montgomery, the Town of Blacksburg, the Town of Christiansburg and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University to form a regional authority to provide the core responsibilities for governance of a consolidated public safety communications center with regional interoperable communications; and

WHEREAS, Before the Regional Authority may be created, the Act requires the governing bodies of the Town of Blacksburg and the Town of Christiansburg and the County of Montgomery and the Board of Visitors for Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, by Resolution, to support the formation of a regional authority to provide 911 dispatch and emergency communications service to the people of each jurisdiction and campus and to approve a memorandum of understanding by and among each of the participating political subdivisions setting forth the terms and conditions of the intended formation of the Authority; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery, Virginia, supports the formation of a regional authority to provide 911 dispatch and emergency communications services for the people of Montgomery County and approve the proposed Memorandum of Understanding regarding the formation of the New River Valley Emergency Communications Regional Authority dated October 25, 2010 by and between the County of Montgomery, Virginia, the Towns of Blacksburg and Christiansburg, Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery, Virginia, that the Board of Supervisors hereby supports the formation of the New River Valley Emergency Communications Regional Authority by the entities of the County of Montgomery, the Town of Blacksburg, the Town of Christiansburg and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University to provide 911 dispatch and emergency communications services for the people of Montgomery County and for Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University campus.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, By the Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery, Virginia that the Board of Supervisors hereby approves the proposed Memorandum of Understanding regarding the formation of the New River Valley Emergency Communications Regional Authority by and between the County of Montgomery, Virginia, the Towns of Blacksburg and Christiansburg, Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and authorizes F. Craig Meadows, County Administrator, to execute the said Memorandum of Understanding on behalf of the County of Montgomery, Virginia.

The vote on the foregoing resolution was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
William H. Brown	None
James D. Politis	
Mary W. Biggs	
Doug Marrs	
John A. Muffo	
Gary D. Creed	
Annette S. Perkins	

R-FY-11-42
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
PROVISION OF VIDEOTAPING SERVICES FOR
CHRISTIANSBURG TOWN COUNCIL MEETINGS

On a motion by Mary W. Biggs, seconded by William H. Brown and carried unanimously,

WHEREAS, The Town of Christiansburg is in need of videotaping services for its Town Council meetings held at the Municipal Building on the first and third Tuesdays of each month at 7:30 p.m. and certain other public meetings as determined by Town Council during budget deliberations and other special times; and

WHEREAS, The County of Montgomery has available the needed video camera equipment and expertise to videotape the meetings of Town Council; and

WHEREAS, The Town of Christiansburg agrees to pay the County for the services of one videographer employed by the County of Montgomery for the purpose of videotaping the meetings of Town Council at a cost of \$35 hourly and at a total cost expected not to exceed \$4,200 annually; and

WHEREAS, The videographer shall remain an employee of the County and shall report and work under the general supervision of Montgomery County; and

WHEREAS, The Memorandum of Understanding is for a term not to exceed 12 months unless extended by mutual agreement by the Town of Christiansburg and the County of Montgomery if the need for videographer services causes payments to exceed \$4,200 within the 12-month period, the MOU may be amended to reflect a new projected annual cost, subject to approval by both entities.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Board of Supervisors of Montgomery County, Virginia that the Board hereby approves the Memorandum of Understanding between the County of Montgomery and the Town of Christiansburg for the purpose of establishing a cooperative agreement between the Town of Christiansburg and Montgomery County for the County to provide videotaping services for Christiansburg Town Council meetings.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, The Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes F. Craig Meadows, County Administrator, to execute a Memorandum of Understanding on behalf of the Board of Supervisors.

The vote on the foregoing resolution was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
James D. Politis	None
Mary W. Biggs	
Doug Marrs	
John A. Muffo	
Gary D. Creed	
William H. Brown	
Annette S. Perkins	

**R-FY-11-43
DEFER TO NOVEMBER 1, 2010 MEETING
MONTGOMERY COUNTY LEGISLATIVE
PRIORITIES FOR 2011**

On a motion by William H. Brown, seconded by Mary W. Biggs and carried unanimously,

BE IT RESOLVED, The Board of Supervisors of the County of Montgomery, Virginia hereby defers their 2011 legislative priorities to the November 1, 2010 meeting.

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
Mary W. Biggs	None
Doug Marrs	
John A. Muffo	
Gary D. Creed	
William H. Brown	
James D. Politis	
Annette S. Perkins	

BOARD MEMBERS' REPORT

Supervisor Biggs PPEA –Supervisor Biggs asked what is the next step after receiving information on PPEA's? The County Administrator stated that the County and the School's are working together to draft a policy. The School Board will need to adopt the policy, not the Board of Supervisors.

Supervisor Politis reported he is receiving numerous questions about the assessment of land values being increased. He would like for the Commissioner of the Revenue to come back before the Board of Supervisors and discuss land use values and the reasoning behind the increase. He would like for the Commissioner to consider lowering the land use values back to the original amount due to the farmers being hit the hardest.

Supervisor Muffo reported due to work obligations he will be out of town the first two weeks in November and will miss any meetings scheduled during this time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned. The Board adjourned to Monday, November 1, 2010 at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

APPROVED: _____	ATTEST: _____
Annette S. Perkins Chair, Board of Supervisors	F. Craig Meadows County Administrator